



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,838	01/25/2002	Shan L. Brooks	7138-1	3405

7590 02/09/2004
Akerman, Senterfitt & Eidson, P.A.
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

PANTUCK, BRADFORD C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3731

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/056,838

Applicant(s)

BROOKS, SHAN L.

Examiner

Bradford C Pantuck

Art Unit

3731

JK

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 31, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on May 31, 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/May 15, 2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-8, drawn to a tourniquet system, classified in class 24, subclass 170.
- II. Claims 9-15, drawn to a method of applying a tourniquet, classified in class 606, subclass 203.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

1. Inventions II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be used for a different process, such as a buckle for a belt wrapped around a person's waist.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II is not required for Group I, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Mark D. Passler on January 30, 2004 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-8. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 9-15 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “base having at least one aperture” (Claim 3) and “a first securing bar” (Claim 6) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. *The base is labeled clearly, but it is unclear where these apertures are located in the drawings. Examiner can not find a “securing bar” that is a part of the base in any of the drawings.*

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,181,280 to Zachry, Jr. Regarding Claim 1, Zachry discloses a strap (60) and a clamp (20) for selectively engaging the strap [this action is best shown in Figure 4]. Continuing to look at Figure 4, as the user pulls the end of strap (colored yellow) in direction A [see Attachment #1], the strap will slide through the clamp substantially freely. However, if the user pulls on the other end of the strap (colored

blue) in direction B, the strap will be prevented from passing through the clamp in a direction towards the clamp. Now with reference to Figure 1, it is apparent that there is another securing clamp (or other means for securing) (10) associated with the strap (60). "Strap retainer" (10) secures the strap to the goggles (50) [Column 2, lines 55-58; see also column 3, line 64-column 4, line 24].

4. Regarding Claim 2, when the user pulls on strap (60), the tension force will increase at both the securing structure (10) and the clamp (20) [Newton's second law: "For every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction."]. Both are completely secure. Such a force would be applied when the user puts the goggles on her head, or when the user puts the goggles around her arm to act as a tourniquet.

5. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,670,946 to Olivieri. Regarding Claim 1, Olivieri does not explicitly disclose a device intended to be a tourniquet. However, he does disclose a strap (1), clamp assembly (13) [Column 2, lines 40-44], and securing structure (lever system 1/2/3/4) [Fig. 2], in accordance with the particulars of the applicant's claimed invention.

To begin, Olivieri's invention is intended for use with a roller skate, ski boot, or similar sporting equipment in which significant *tightening of a boot around a human limb is necessary* [Column 1, lines 4-15]. In the just recited passage, he refers to his invention as a "tensioning assembly." Thus, were someone to gash one's foot, Olivieri's device tensioning device in tandem with the boot could be used as a tourniquet system around the ankle in order to limit blood loss through the foot.

As anyone who skis or uses in-line skates is well-aware, Olivieri's clamp (13) will allow strap (1) to pass through in the direction away from the securing structure (1/2/3/4), but will disallow the strap from retreating back towards the securing structure (unless the user lifts lever 22 as shown in Fig. 2) [Column 3, lines 33-38].

6. Regarding Claim 2, Olivieri discloses a securing structure that further secures the strap (1) when the clamp (13) engages the strap [Column 3, lines 30-33].
7. Regarding Claim 6, Olivieri discloses a base with

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,670,946 to Olivieri. Regarding Claim 3, and with reference to Figure 3, Olivieri discloses a securing structure having a cover (2) with a pin (8 and 9). Olivieri discloses a base (3) with an aperture (11) for receiving the cover pin (9a). Olivieri further discloses a traveling arm (4) rotatably coupled to the cover with a pin. However, the pin (8/9) is on the cover (2), rather than on the traveling arm (4) and the aperture (6/7) is in the traveling arm, rather than on the cover. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to put the pin (8/9) on the traveling arm and have the aperture be on the cover, since it has

been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

9. Regarding Claim 5, the modified Olivieri system now has holes through arms (2a) and (2b) to receive the pin that is now in the position of holes (6 & 7) in the traveling arm. The hole in one of these arms is the aforementioned aperture and the other hole is "an opening for receiving a projection for lifting" the cover. The traveling arm has a slot at its distal end (located between arms 2a and 2b).
10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,670,946 to Olivieri in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,311,372 to Wang. Olivieri discloses the invention as claimed, but does not have a lock for securing the cover and the traveling arm to the base. However, Wang discloses another buckle for skates and teaches that one should provide a lock (25 locks with 26 in Fig. 3) for such a lever system so that the securing structure is not unintentionally loosened [Column 1, line 35]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a lock for securing the cover and traveling arm to the base, in order to make sure that the securing system stays tight during use, as taught by Wang.
11. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,451,234 to Wassermann in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,670,946 to Olivieri. Wasserman discloses a tourniquet system, including a flexible strap (2) made out of a flexible nylon material [Column 5, lines 35-55]. Wasserman discloses

a fastening means (5), but the fastening means does not include a clamp or a securing structure.

However, Olivieri discloses a fastening means also intended to be used as a means of securing a band around a person's limb. Olivieri's fastening means includes both a clamp (13) and a securing structure (1/2/3/4), as explained above. His fastening means provides mechanical advantage, because it includes a "second class" lever as a part of its securing structure [Column 1, lines 15-24]. Such mechanical advantage *would make it easier for a user to tighten such a device* about a person's leg using only one hand.

Olivieri's system is also incrementally adjustable, i.e. the user can determine how much to compress the leg to a very specific degree. This is because Olivieri's leg-compressing system includes a strap (1) with serrations.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the fastening system of Wasserman with the fastening system of Olivieri in order to make tightening the band around a limb mechanically easier (less work) and to make the fastener incrementally adjustable, as taught by Olivieri.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 6 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 947,284 to Sourek

U.S. Patent No. 1,522 to Fogg

U.S. Patent No. 4,843,688 to Ikeda

U.S. Patent No. 1,092,203 to Carter

U.S. Patent No. 6,499,197 B1 to Huang

U.S. Patent No. 2,893,394 to Thomsen

U.S. Patent No. 5,001,847 to Waters

U.S. Patent No. 5,592,722 to Foscaro et al.

U.S. Patent No. 1,057,714 to Davis

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradford C Pantuck whose telephone number is (703) 305-8621. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael J Milano can be reached on (703) 308-2496. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3731

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BCP
BCP

February 2, 2004

MICHAEL J. MILANO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

